

Appl. No. 10/780,437  
Response Dated August 2, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of May 2, 2006

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
AUG 02 2006

**REMARKS**

**I. Status of the Claims**

Claims 1-36 are currently pending in this Application. Of these, claims 10-18 are allowed. Claims 19, 20, 21, and 29 are sought to be amended. Applicants believe that these changes do not add new matter. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

**II. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)**

Claims 19 and 29-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,065,137 to Herman ("Herman"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Amended independent claims 19 and 29 each recite planarized coil features. By rejecting these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), the Examiner is asserting that Herman discloses such planarized features. However, in other portions of the Office Action (e.g., at page 4, line 10 and at page 7, line 19), the Examiner asserts that Herman does not disclose planarized coils. For at least this reason, Applicants request that the rejection of these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Moreover, independent claims 19 and 29 recite features involving overlapping resonance circuits. For instance, claim 19 recites "a pair of overlapping resonance circuits." Also, claim 29 recites "a second resonant circuit overlapping said first resonance circuit."

Appl. No. 10/780,437  
Response Dated August 2, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of May 2, 2006

Herman fails to teach or suggest this feature. Furthermore, Herman teaches away from overlapping circuits. For instance, at column 3, line 67 through column 4, line 1, Herman states that "the coils should be at least 0.375 inch [sic] apart to prevent such interactive coupling as would make tuning of both resonant circuits 10, 14 difficult."

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that "Figure 1 and the corresponding disclosure [of Herman] clearly shows coil L1 aligned and overlapping directly with coil L2 such that linear core 12 extends into the center of both coils L1 and L2." However, notwithstanding any alleged alignment of coils L1 and L2, these coils do not overlap. This is demonstrated in Herman by the inclusion of a core 12 having a substantial length and providing substantial separation between coils.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

### **III. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1-9, 20-28, and 32-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Herman in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,894,614 to Eckstein et al. ("Eckstein"). In rejecting these claims, the Examiner fails to provide any motivation or suggestion for combining Herman and Eckstein, as required by MPEP 2143. Instead, of providing reasons, the Examiner merely provides conclusory statements, such as "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art." Therefore, Applicants request reconsideration of these claims.

Moreover, technical differences exist between these claims and the applied references. For instance, independent claim 1 recites first and second planarized coils.

Appl. No. 10/780,437  
Response Dated August 2, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of May 2, 2006

Also, claim 1 states "a portion of said second planarized coil to overlap a portion of said first planarized coil." The Examiner asserts that this feature is disclosed by Herman. However, this feature is neither disclosed nor suggested by Herman for at least the reasons provided above. Also, as set forth above, Herman teaches away from such overlapping features. Moreover, Eckstein provides no suggestion for such overlapping features.

Therefore Applicants request that the rejection of claim 1 and its dependent claims 2-9 be withdrawn.

Claims 20-28 depend from independent claim 19, which recites features involving overlapping circuits. As discussed above, such features are neither taught nor suggested by Herman in view of Eckstein. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 32 and 33 depend from independent claim 29, which recites features involving overlapping circuits. As discussed above, such features are neither taught nor suggested by Herman in view of Eckstein. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

With respect to independent claim 34 and its dependent claims 35 and 36, no motivation or suggestion for combining Herman and Eckstein is provided. Applicants assert that no such motivation or suggestion exists. Accordingly, Applicants request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/780,437  
Response Dated August 2, 2006  
Reply to Office Action of May 2, 2006

#### IV. Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed accommodated or rendered moot. Applicants believe that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action. However, Applicants hereby reserve the right to make additional arguments regarding distinctions between the claims and the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

Thus, Applicants believe that the present application is in condition for allowance, and as such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections, and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

KACVINSKY LLC

s/John A. Harroun/s

John A. Harroun, Reg. No. 46,339  
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: August 2, 2006

4500 Brooktree Road, Suite 102  
Wexford, PA 15090  
(724) 933-5529

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 or facsimile transmitted to the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.	
<u>August 2, 2006</u> Date of Deposit	
<u>Deborah L. Higham</u> Name of Person Mailing Correspondence	
<u>[Signature]</u> Signature	<u>8/02/06</u> Date